

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1–6, 8–14, 17, and 19–20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended, and claims 17 and 19–20 have been canceled hereinabove. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1–6, 8–14, 17 and 19–20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi, U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,759 (“*Kobayashi*”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to more expressly recite characteristics of the presently claimed invention that distinguish over the subject matter of *Kobayashi*. More specifically, these claims now more clearly emphasize how the presently claimed invention pushes content via the “wireless device” for display on the “interface client” in accordance with the received information about the display capabilities of the interface client. This is particularly emphasized in the recitations of “displaying the content on a display of the interface client in accordance with display control information provided by at least one of the remote source and wireless device” (claim 1 with emphasis added) and “at least one of the wireless device and remote source is adapted to format the content based on the information about the interface client” (claim 9 with emphasis added).

This is contradistinctive to the subject matter of *Kobayashi* which pulls content for display. In other words, as opposed to learning about the capabilities of a display device and then pushing and controlling the content for display on such device, as in the presently claimed invention, the system of *Kobayashi* pulls content from a source and then, locally within the display device itself, controls how such content is to be displayed. This is made clear at column 4, lines 26–32, where it is stated that the system of *Kobayashi* implements “bi-directional data communication function such that data on desired software installed in the PC 1 is sent to the cellular phone 2 by a manipulation made on the cellular phone 2 to be displayed on the screen thereof, or data on desired software installed in the cellular phone 2 is sent to the PC 1 by a manipulation made on the PC 1 to be displayed on the screen thereof” (emphasis added). In

other words, in the first instance, the cellular phone 2 pulls data from the PC 1 and manipulates it for display on its screen, while in the second instance, the PC 1 pulls data from the cellular phone 2 and manipulates it for display on its screen. Hence, in the first instance, the PC 1 as the data source plays no role in its manipulation (i.e., control or formatting) for display by the cellular phone 2, while in the second instance, the cellular phone 2 as the data source plays no role in its manipulation for display by the PC 1.


### **Conclusion**

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made and that all rejections have been properly traversed. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections, and it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (312) 609-7620.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 20, 2009

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
(312) 609-7620  
fax: (312) 609-5005

By:   
Mark A. Dalla Valle, Reg. No. 34,147